

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
NORTHERN DIVISION

FILED

NOV 16 2010

SS

RONALD MARLYN WOLBERT,

*

CIV 10-1008

Plaintiff,

*

ORDER AND OPINION

-vs-

DANNY SMEINS and BARRY HILLESTAD,

Defendants.

*

Plaintiff has served but has not filed what he calls "request for clarification." He refers to the document, which is directed to me, as a motion. Obviously, a district court judge cannot and will not give any legal advice to either party. The request is denied.

Plaintiff filed a motion, Doc. 15, for "recognition of indigent status." He apparently seeks free PACER and WESTLAW access. Plaintiff filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. I found that plaintiff satisfied the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) and authorized the plaintiff to file his complaint without the prepayment of the statutory filing fee. Section 1915 does not authorize the district court to compel private businesses to provide free legal research services or free access to electronic records to the plaintiff. The cost of conducting legal research in connection with civil actions is a cost borne by the parties, whether they choose to do the research themselves or pay an attorney to do so. Likewise, the cost of access to electronic docket entries is a cost borne by the parties. Pro se plaintiffs are not required to file electronically. Plaintiff can view his electronic case record at public terminals at the federal Clerk of Courts offices in Pierre, Rapid City, and Sioux Falls. However, like all members of the public, including attorneys, he would be required to pay for copies of documents printed.

Now, therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion, Doc. 15, is denied.

Dated this 18th day of November, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

Charles B. Kornmann
CHARLES B. KORNMANN
United States District Judge

ATTEST:

JOSEPH HAAS, CLERK

BY: *Barbara Haas*
DEPUTY
(SEAL)